REMARKS

Claims 8, 9, 11, 20, 21, and 23 are amended herein. New Claims 30 and 31 are added herein. Claims in the instant case are Claims 1-31.

112 Rejection

Claims 9-12 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 9 and 21 have been amended herein to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 11 and 23 are amended herein to correct an informality, and their amended subject matter incorporated into new Claims 30 and 31, respectively.

102(b) Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Helms (5,760,760). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claim 1, is not anticipated by Helms and that Claims 2, 3, 8, as amended herein, 9 as amended herein, and 10, as they depend from Claim 1 and recite additional limitations of the present claimed invention, are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Helms.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

> "A portable computer system comprising:
> a processor coupled to a bus;.....
> a lighted display device coupled to said bus and for providing a visual display;....
> a data storage device coupled to said bus and comprising preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and
> wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." (emphasis added)

Claims 2,3,8,9 and 10 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

In contrast to the present claimed invention, Helms does not teach or suggest the limitation of Claim 1 in which the portable computer system comprises "...preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." Rather, Helms teaches storing a plurality of brightness levels that together may make a single set of values.

However, the claimed embodiment specifically recites that a plurality of different brightness ranges are preconfigured and stored and that one of these

ranges may be selected. In contrast, Helms fails to teach or suggest any preconfigured brightness ranges at all. It is the storage and selection of the multiple brightness ranges that provide an advantage for the present invention because various brightness ranges may operate better in varied lighting situations. This advantage is not taught or appreciated by Helms.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that there is no basis for concluding that the device of Helms, or any of the other elements of Helms, use a portable computer system in the manner claimed by the present invention; specifically, in a portable computer system as recited in independent Claim 1.

Helms does not anticipate dependent Claim 9. Claim 9, as currently amended, recites

> The portable computer system....wherein, based on a position of said user-adjustable slider, the relative brightness setting remains unchanged with respect to a range upon an automatic change from one selected range to another selected range.

Applicants respectfully submit once again that Helms does not teach or suggest any stored brightness ranges. Claim 9 suggests an automatic setting change among selected ranges. Since Helms does not teach stored ranges, Applicants submit that an automatic setting change from one selected range to another selected range based on a position of a user-adjustable slider is neither taught nor appreciated by Helms.

Applicants further submit that Helms does not teach or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2, 3, 8, and 10 that are dependent on Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claim 13, is not anticipated by Helms and that Claim 15, as it depends from Claim 13 and recites additional features of the present claimed invention, is not anticipated by Helms.

Independent Claim 13 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

> "A portable electronic device comprising:
> a processor coupled to a bus;.....
> a lighted display device coupled to said bus and for providing a visual display;....
> a data storage device coupled to said bus and comprising preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and
> wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." (emphasis added)

Claim 15 is dependent on Claim 13 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

In contrast to the present claimed invention, Helms does not teach or suggest the limitation of Claim 13 in which the portable computer system comprises "...preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data

for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." Rather, Helms teaches storing a plurality of points or brightness levels that together may make a single set of values.

However, the claimed embodiment specifically recites that a plurality of different brightness ranges are preconfigured and stored and that one range may be selected. In contrast, Helms fails to teach or suggest any preconfigured brightness ranges at all. It is the storage and selection of the multiple brightness ranges that provide an advantage for the present invention because various ranges may operate better in varied lighting situations. This advantage is not taught or appreciated by Helms.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that there is no basis for concluding that the device of Helms, or any of the other elements of Helms, use a portable electronic device in the manner of the present invention, specifically, in a portable computer system as recited in independent Claim 13. Applicants further submit that Helms does not teach or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 15 that is dependent on Claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 15 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claim 25, as amended, is not anticipated

by Helms and that Claims 26, 28 and 29, as they depend from Claim 25 as amended herein and recite additional features of the present claimed invention, are not anticipated by Helms. Independent Claim 25 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

> "In a portable electronic device, a method of responding to a change in ambient light conditions comprising:
> a) detecting said change in ambient light conditions and generating a signal in response thereto;
> b) in response to said signal, a processor of said portable electronic device selecting a brightness range from a plurality of stored brightness ranges based on preconfigured range information; and
> c) implementing said brightness range to alter the brightness of a display device of said portable electronic device." (emphasis added)

Claims 26, 28 and 29 are dependent on Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

In contrast to the present claimed invention, Helms does not teach or suggest the limitation of Claim 25 in which, in a portable electronic device, a method comprises "...selecting a brightness range from a plurality of stored brightness ranges... said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." Rather, Helms teaches storing a plurality of points that together may make a single set of values.

However, the claimed embodiment specifically recites that a plurality of different brightness ranges are preconfigured and stored and that one range may

be selected. In contrast, Helms fails to teach or suggest any preconfigured brightness ranges at all. It is the storage and selection of the multiple brightness ranges that provide an advantage for the present invention because various ranges may operate better in varied lighting situations. This advantage is not taught or appreciated by Helms.

Applicants respectfully assert that there is no basis for concluding that the device of Helms, or any of the other elements of Helms, show a portable electronic device with the method of the present invention, specifically, in a portable electronic device as recited in independent Claim 25. Applicants further submit that Helms does not teach or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 26, 28 and 29 that are dependent on Claim 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 25, 26, 28 and 29 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

103 Rejection

Claims 4-6 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms (US Patent No. 5,5,760,760). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 4-6 and 16-18 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Helms, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Helms.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants thus respectfully re-assert that Claim 1 incorporates subject matter including "...preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." (emphasis added). Helms teaches storing a plurality of brightness levels that together may form a single set of values, but nowhere does Helms teach or suggest the limitation of a plurality of stored ranges from which a processor automatically selects a stored range.

Claims 4-6 depend upon independent Claim 1. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim on which they depend. Thus Applicants respectfully submit that Helms does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 4-6 that depend from independent Claim 1.

Claim 13 incorporates subject matter including "a portable electronic device comprising "...preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." (emphasis added). Helms teaches storing a plurality of points or brightness levels that together may form a set of values.

However, the present embodiment specifically recites that a plurality of different brightness ranges are preconfigured and stored and that one range may be automatically selected. In contrast, Helms fails to teach or suggest any preconfigured brightness ranges or any stored brightness ranges at all. Therefore, the selection of a range is not taught or suggested.

Claims 16-18 depend upon independent Claim 13. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim on which they depend. Thus Applicants respectfully submit that Helms does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 16-18 that depend from independent Claim 13.

Claims 7, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms (5,760,760) in view of Wagner (5,933,130). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 14, 19, 20, 21 and 27 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Helms in view of Wagner, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Helms in view of Wagner.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants thus respectfully re-assert that Claim 1 incorporates subject matter including "...preconfigured dynamically adjustable brightness range setting data for implementing a plurality of different ranges; and wherein said processor automatically selects a stored range of said plurality of stored ranges

based on said ambient light information signal from said light sensor." Helms teaches storing a plurality of points or brightness levels that together may form a set of values. Wagner teaches methods of adjusting brightness levels. The combination of Helms and Wagner does not teach or suggest selecting a stored range from a plurality of ranges. Since the combination of Helms and Wagner does not teach preconfigured ranges of brightness, storing a range of a plurality of ranges is not obvious over Helms in view of Wagner.

Claim 7 depends upon independent Claim 1. Claims 14, 19, 20, 21 and 22 depend upon independent Claim 13. Claim 27 depends upon independent Claim 25. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim on which they depend.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as not being anticipated or rendered obvious by Helms and Wagner fails to remedy the defect. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Helms and Wagner does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 7,14,19,20,21,22 and 27.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of these Claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicants further point out that no contested Claims remain in the present Application.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 11/7/2003

Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060